

Alice Yeh/R2/USEPA/US

08/16/2005 01:22 PM

To Elizabeth.A.Buckrucker, Elizabeth Butler

cc

bcc

Subject Bi-Weekly Progress Calls

I've been thinking that we need to better organize our bi-weekly progress calls with the consultants. Starting with the Action Items is too disjointed and could lead us to forget to ask about progress on due dates that are upcoming on our schedules but not on the Action Items list. I wondered if we should go back to having narrative reports on topics first, then touch on Action Items at the very end (and if we've covered the action items in the earlier reports, all the better). Perhaps the following sort of order could be used as a guide:

- 1) Preparation for 2005 field work: includes logistics, work plan approvals, PREmis/NBmis field application development, subcontract approvals
 - Passaic River: high res cores, water quality sampling, low res cores
 - Newark Bay: bathymetry, SPI, low res cores
- 2) Progress on on-going field work
 - Passaic River: hydrodynamic sampling
 - Newark Bay: none for now
- 3) Completed field work that still has outstanding deliverables
 - Passaic River: hydrodyn data transfer from MPI to HQI, sedflume/microcosm final reports, geophysical survey (incl SPI) rpts/data from Lisa Baron.
 - Newark Bay: none for now
- 4) Preparation for 2006 field work: includes work planning
 - Passaic River: FSP 2, check in on Dundee Dam proposal
 - Newark Bay:
- 5) CSM/Evaluation of Historical Data
- 6) Modeling
- 7) Risk Assessment
- 8) Preliminary Feasibility Evaluation (Passaic River only?)
- 9) Community Involvement (includes fact sheets, CIP, public forums)
- 10) Action Items

The order is starting with what I think of as most important, but I realize that this means keeping the subs on the phone forever, so perhaps we should put items 5-7 first. Let me know what you think.